



have been designated as “Highly Confidential” pursuant to the Stipulated Protective Order entered in this matter (ECF No. 25).

**Local Rule 5(c), Sections 2 and 3 – A statement why sealing is necessary, references to governing case law, analysis of the appropriate standard, and a description of how the standard has been satisfied**

Sealing the referenced documents is necessary because the documents are designated Highly Confidential per the Stipulated Protective Order. Sealing of information about Steves’ past purchases, planned orders, JELD-WEN’s production, and JELD-WEN’s production capacity is required because the information is commercially sensitive. No other procedure will suffice, because once this information is made public it cannot be retracted.

Documents should be sealed when a party’s interest in keeping the information contained therein confidential outweighs the right of public access to judicial documents. *See, e.g., Stone v. Univ. of Maryland Med. Sys. Corp.*, 855 F.2d 178 (4th Cir. 1988); *Ashcraft v. Conoco, Inc.*, 218 F.3d 288, 302 (4th Cir. 2000). The United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit has directed that district courts should consider the following factors when determining whether to exercise their discretion to seal documents: (1) “whether the records are sought for improper purposes, such as promoting public scandals or unfairly gaining a business advantage;” (2) “whether release would enhance the public’s understanding of an important historical event; and” (3) “whether the public has already had access to the information contained in the records.” *Va. Dept. of State Police v. Wash. Post*, 386 F.3d 567, 575 (4th Cir. 2004).

Here, there could be an “unfair business advantage” gained by any party who had access to Steves’ or JELD-WEN’s trade secret and confidential information. The public has never had access to the information at issue and it is routinely kept in confidence in the course of business. These are appropriate grounds for sealing.

**Local Rule 5(c), Section 4 – Statement as to the period of time the party seeks to have the matter maintained under seal**

JELD-WEN requests that the documents designated as “Highly Confidential” and discussions thereof be filed under seal, pursuant to the Stipulated Protective Order (ECF No. 25), entered February 20, 2020.

JELD-WEN believes that its trade secret and confidential information should remain permanently sealed in the absence of a ruling that the information is not confidential. As reflected in Steves’ motion to seal, JELD-WEN presumes Steves harbors a similar belief about its information.

JELD-WEN’s grounds for requesting that its disclosures about Steves’ past purchases and planned orders for doorskins and JELD-WEN’s past production and production capacity be filed under seal are that the information is highly confidential and commercially sensitive information to which the public has not had access and that Steves or JELD-WEN would be harmed if the public did have access to such information.

The documents sought to be filed under seal are being filed electronically with the Court contemporaneously, as required by Local Civil Rule 5. Redacted versions of the documents are being filed publicly.

Dated: May 22, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

JELD-WEN, Inc.

By counsel

/s/ Brian C. Riopelle

Brian C. Riopelle (VSB #36454)

McGuireWoods LLP

Gateway Plaza

800 East Canal Street

Richmond, VA 23219

(804) 775-1084 – Tel.

(804) 698-2150 – Fax

briopelle@mcguirewoods.com

*Attorney for Defendant*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 22nd day of May 2020, the following counsel of record have been served using the CM/ECF system, which will then send a notification of such filing (NEF) to the registered participants as identified on the NEF to receive electronic service, including:

Lewis F. Powell III  
John S. Martin  
Alexandra L. Klein  
Maya M. Eckstein  
Douglas M. Garron  
R. Dennis Fairbanks, Jr.  
Michael Shebelskie  
William H. Wright, Jr.  
Hunton Andrews Kurth LLP  
Riverfront Plaza, East Tower  
951 East Byrd Street  
Richmond, VA 23219  
(804) 788-8200 – Tel.  
(804) 788-8218 – Fax  
lpowell@huntonAK.com  
martinj@huntonAK.com  
aklein@huntonAK.com  
meckstein@huntonAK.com  
dgarrou@huntonAK.com  
dfairbanks@huntonAK.com  
mshebelskie@huntonAK.com  
cwright@huntonAK.com

Ted Dane  
Glenn Pomerantz  
Gregory Sergi  
Munger, Tolles & Olson LLP  
350 South Grand Avenue, 50th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
(213) 683-9288 – Tel.  
(213) 683-4088 – Fax  
ted.dane@mto.com  
glenn.pomerantz@mto.com  
gregory.sergi@mto.com

Kyle Mach  
Emily C. Curran-Huberty

Munger, Tolles & Olson LLP  
560 Mission Street, 27th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
(415) 512-4000 – Tel.  
(415) 512-4077 – Fax  
kyle.mach@mto.com  
emily.curran-huberty@mto.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

Marvin G. Pipkin  
Kortney Kloppe-Orton  
Pipkin Law  
10001 Reunion Place, Suite 6400  
San Antonio, TX 78216  
(210) 731-6495 – Tel.  
(210) 293-2139 – Fax

*Of Counsel*

/s/ Brian C. Riopelle  
Brian C. Riopelle (VSB #36454)  
McGuireWoods LLP  
Gateway Plaza  
800 East Canal Street  
Richmond, VA 23219  
(804) 775-1084 – Tel.  
(804) 698-2150 – Fax  
briopelle@mcguirewoods.com

*Attorney for Defendant*